

PATENT**D3239-00002****III. Remarks**

Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-22, 24-30 are pending in the present application.

Independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, and 26 have been amended to recite that the identified or designated content comprises "at least one image." Dependent Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 19, and 24 have been amended consistent with the amendments to their corresponding independent claims. The dependency of Claims 4 and 12 have also been corrected.

Claim 26 has also been amended to recited two geometric area selection steps – a first corresponding to content having at least one image and a second corresponding to content comprising text.

Claims 1, 5, 17, 21 and 26 have been amended to be directed to "computer implemented" methods and systems.

New Claims 31-34 have been added and are discussed in more detail below.

All pending claims stand rejected. Applicants are grateful to the Examiner for withdrawing the previous rejections of the claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the new rejections are respectfully requested.

A. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Action rejects Claims 5-6, 8, 13-14, 16, 21-22, 24 and 25 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner suggests amending independent Claims 5, 13, 21, 25 and 26 to be directed to "computer implemented" methods and systems. Applicants have amended independent Claims 5 and 21 as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicants have not amended Claim 26 as that claim is not rejected by the Action, nor are similar Claims 1 and 17.

PATENT**D3239-00002**

Applicants have not amended Claim 13, as Claim 13 is directed to a "storage medium having stored therein a plurality of instructions, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform the [recited] steps." Applicants submit that this is clearly directed to statutory subject matter as presented.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

B. Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Action rejects all pending claims as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,581,682 to Anderson et al. in view of the Digital Applications Web Article on the Redax product (hereinafter "Redax").

Applicants are familiar with the Redax product, as Appligent, Inc., formerly known as Digital Applications, Inc., is the owner of the present application.

Each of the independent claims now recite that the identified or designated content for redaction include at least one image. Claims 1, 9, 17 and 26 also recite that the one or more content objects comprise "one or more image occurrence objects." As explained in the present application, Applicants' present invention can be employed in the redaction of text from, for example, PDF documents and in the redaction of images (i.e., pictures) from these documents. (Specification, Pages 6-7). Different redaction methods are described for text redaction and for image redaction, with redacted text being replaced with exemption codes, hyphens or other material and image redaction being carried out on a pixel-by-pixel basis, with identified pixels being replaced rather than identified text. Comparison of annotation objects are made to content objects that are text occurrence objects and to content objects that are image occurrence objects to remove identified text and to remove identified images (or portions of images).

The Redax document cited by the Examiner clearly illustrates that the Redax product listed in the publication could only redact text. This version of the Redax product had no

PHI\1470278.1

PATENT

D3239-00002

functionality for redacting images. See Redax ("Redax for text and images will be available January, 1998"). Therefore, it is submitted that the combination of Anderson et al. and Redax does not teach each element claimed in independent Claims 1, 9, 17 and 26, i.e., "creating an electronic output file, said identified content not present in said output file, a redacted document being producible from said output file for display" where the identified content comprises "at least one image." Likewise, with respect to independent Claims 5, 13, and 21, the combination of references does not teach "means for manipulating a frame displayed on the document while content having a geographic location with said frame is visible to the user, said content comprising at least one image."

For at least these reasons, it is submitted that independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21 and 26, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not obvious from, and are allowable over, the art of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

C. New Claims

New Claims 31-34 have been added, depending on Claims 1, 9, 17 and 26. Examination of these claims is respectfully requested.

These claims are directed to the embodiment where identified image content is redacted by replacing pixels corresponding to the identified content. This embodiment is described at, for example, and supported by, the Specification, Page 7, second full paragraph.

PATENT

D3239-00002

IV. Conclusion


In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance at an early date, which action is earnestly solicited.

In the event that the Examiner does not find the claims to be in allowable format, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to discuss the proposed rejection before issuing any substantive office action so that resolution of the application may be expedited.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any excess payment that may be associated with this communication to deposit account 04-1679.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/5/05


Joseph A. Powers, Reg. No.: 47,006
Attorney For Applicants

DUANE MORRIS LLP
One Liberty Place
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-7396
(215) 979-1842 (Telephone)
(215) 979-1020 (Fax)